

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

MAURICE JILES

Plaintiff,

vs.

OFFICER C/O ROBERSON,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:15-cv-00317-RFB-GWF

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion to Compel (ECF No. 27) and Motion to Compel (ECF No. 28), filed on October 27, 2016.

Plaintiff filed his answers to Defendant's requests for admission (ECF No. 27) and his answers to Defendant's requests for production of documents (ECF No. 28) with the Court. The certificate of service by mailing on each document indicates that Plaintiff mailed the documents to the Lloyd D. George United States Courthouse, 333 Las Vegas Boulevard South, Las Vegas, Nevada, but Plaintiff did not mail the documents to Defendant's counsel.

Although Courts broadly construe pleadings filed by pro se litigants, even pro se litigants must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep't.*, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir.1990); *see also Carter v. Comm'r of Internal Revenue*, 784 F.2d 1006, 1008 (9th Cir. 1986). Pro se litigants are not treated more favorably than parties with attorneys of record and are expected to abide by the rules of the court in which litigation proceeds. *Carter*, 784 F.2d at 1008. Pleadings by pro se litigants, regardless of deficiencies, should only be judged by function, not form. *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 521 (1972).

Even broadly construed, Plaintiff's Motions fail procedurally. Plaintiff's Motions do not request relief. Plaintiff's answers to written discovery propounded by Defendant do not need to be

1 filed with the Court. Accordingly, the Court strikes Plaintiff's documents (ECF No. 27 and 28) from the
2 docket. The Court instructs Plaintiff to mail his answers to Defendant's request for admission and request
3 for production of documents to Defendant's counsel. If Plaintiff intends to proceed with this case pro se,
4 he must fully educate himself on the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rules of Practice for the
5 District of Nevada.

6 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion to Compel (ECF No. 27) and Motion to
7 Compel (ECF No. 28) are **denied**.

8 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Court strikes ECF No. 27 and ECF No. 28 from the
9 docket.

10 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff is to mail his answers to Defendant's request for
11 admission and request for production of documents to Defendant's counsel.

12 DATED this 31st day of October, 2016.

13
14 
15 GEORGE FOLEY, JR.
16 United States Magistrate Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28